

CASE NO.: 50P4257.05  
Serial No.: 09/972,183  
March 30, 2004  
Page 8

PATENT  
Filed: October 5, 2001

#### Remarks

Reconsideration of the above-captioned application is respectfully requested. Affirmation of the election of Claims 1-17 and 23-25 is made. Non-elected Claims 18-22 have been amended to place them in better condition for allowance should a generic claim be allowed.

Claims 24 and 25 have been objected to failing to further limit the subject matter of previous claims. It appears that the objection is incorrect, in that Claim 24 recites "security data" whereas Claim 23 does not. The objection will not be further addressed.

Claims 1, 2, 11-14 and 16 have been rejected as being anticipated by Helle, and Claims 23-25 have been rejected as being anticipated by Findikli. Claims 3-7 have been rejected as being obvious over Helle in view of Borgelt, while Claims 8-10, 15, and 17 have been rejected as being obvious over Helle in view of Borgelt and further in view of Findikli.

To overcome the rejections, all independent claims now recite that the host/peripheral device has an input device (such as a keypad) and a display, as now shown in Figure 1. Support for the new figure can be found in the specification on page 4, lines 24-26, disclosing that the host/peripheral device 150 can be any one of a number of components (PDA, PC, etc.) that have, as is well known, input devices such as keypads or keyboards and displays that a user can view. Claims 1-25 remain pending.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 11-14 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Helle, and Claims 23-25 have been rejected as being anticipated by Findikli. Of relevance to the amended claims appears to be the rejections based on Helle, col. 1, lines 9-35, col. 3, lines 5-7, and col. 3, line 64 continuing

1168-107.AMB

CASE NO.: 50P4257.05  
Serial No.: 09/972,183  
March 30, 2004  
Page 9

PATENT  
Filed: October 5, 2001

to col. 4, line 2. Although the Office Action does not articulate what, precisely, in Helle is being used as the claimed "wireless module" and what is being used as the claimed "peripheral device", Applicant believes that the wireless phone of Helle is being used as the "wireless module", since that is the only wireless component shown in Helle and discussed in the sections cited by the Examiner. This means that the only component left that could be used as the claimed "peripheral device" (or host device, etc.) is the SIM card of Helle.

As now amended, the claims require that the peripheral/host device be something more than a card. They require the host to be a computing device that has an input device and a display, unlike a SIM card, which is just a card. The claimed system thus is now something totally different than Helle's system, which is directed solely to the interaction between a SIM card and a wireless phone, not to a wireless module and a user computer device. Findikli likewise appears to be exclusively directed to mobile phones and their SIM cards. Accordingly, the rejections under this section have been overcome.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 3-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Helle in view of Borgelt, while Claims 8-10, 15, and 17 have been rejected as being obvious over Helle in view of Borgelt and further in view of Findikli. For the reasons set forth above, it does not appear that the relied-upon references teach or suggest the present combination of structure.

The Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned at (619) 338-8075 for any reason which would advance the instant application to allowance.

1168-107.AMD

CASE NO.: 50P4257.05  
Serial No.: 09/972,183  
March 30, 2004  
Page 10

PATENT  
Filed: October 5, 2001

Respectfully submitted,



---

John L. Rogitz  
Registration No. 33,549  
Attorney of Record  
750 B Street, Suite 3120  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Telephone: (619) 338-8075

JLR:jg

1168-107.AMD